A breef declaration of the *Lordes Supper*,

Written by the ſinguler learned Man, and moſte conſtant Martyr of Chriſte: NICHOLAS RIDLEY Biſhop of London, priſoner in Oxforde, a little before he ſuffered death for the true teſtimonye of Ieſus CHRISTE.

(*)

Rom. 8.

For thy ſake are we killed all day long, and are counted as ſheep apoynted to be ſlain. Neuertheleſſe, in all theſe thinges we ouercome through him that loue vs.

* Imprinted at LONDON for (Abraham Veale) dwelling in Paules Church-yard at the ſigne of the LAMBE.

1586.

352 ; 99

To the Reader.

VNderstand good (Reader) that this great clark and blessed Martyr Bishop Nicholas Ridley, sought not by settinge foorth any notable peece of learned woork, the vaine glory of the world, nor temporall freendship of men, for his present aduancement, much lesse he hunted heerby for bishoprickes and benefices, as al his aduersaries, the enemies of Christs trueth and ordinance, the Papists commonly do: but hauing consideration of the great charge of soule committed vnto him, and of the account thereof, which the Iustice of God would require at his handes, intending therwithal to be found blam-

les in the great daye of the Lord, seeing he was put a parte to defende the Gospell: he not only forsook Landes, goodes, world, frends, and himselfe withall, and testified the trueth specified in this book by his learned mouth in the open presence of the world: but also to leaue a sure monument & loue token vnto his flocke, hee hath registred it by his owne pen in this forme ensuinge, and sealed it vp with his blood. For asmuch thē as he hath proued himselfe no vain disputer, no wethercocke, nor hipocrite, seeing hee hath willinglye giuen his life for the trueth and in as much also as his loue and moste constant christen conscience speaketh vnto thee (gentle Reader)

I beseech thee for Christs sake and thine owne, lend him thine indifferēt hart and pacient hearing.

(*)

FINIS.

Lords Supper.

MANY things confounde a weake memory: A few plaine wel weighed and perceiued, lighten the vnderstanding. Trueth is there to be searched, where it is certain to be had, though God doth speake the trueth by man, yet in mans worde, which God hath not reuealed to be his, a man may doubt without mistrust in God. Christe is the trueth of God reuealed vnto man from Heauen by God him self, and therfore in his worde the trueth is to be founde, which is to be embraced of al that be his. Christ biddeth vs aske, and we shall haue: search and we shall finde: knocke, and it shall be opened vnto vs. Therfore our Heauenly Father, the Author: and fountain of al trueth, the bottomles Sea of al vnderstanding, send down we beseech thee, thy holy spirit into our harts, and lighten our vnderstanding with the beames of thy heauenlye grace. We aske thee this, O mercifull father, not in respect of our deserts, but for thy deere Sonne our Sauiour Iesus Christs sake. Thou knowest, O heauenly Father, that the controuersie about the Sacrament of the blessed body and blod of thy deer sonne

The blessed Martirs prayer.

our Sauiour Iesu Christe, hath troubled not of late onlye the Churche of England, Fraunce, Germanie, and Italye, but also many yeers agoe. The fault is ours (no dout) therfore, for we haue deserued thy plague. But (O Lord) be mercifull, and relæue our miserie with some lighte of grace. Thou knowest (O Lord) how this wicked worlde rolleth vp and down, and reeleth to and fro: and careth not what thy will is, so it may abide in wealth. If trueth haue wealthe, who are so stoute to defende the trueth, as they? But if Christes crosse be laid on trueths back, then they vanishe away straight, as ware before the fier. But these are not they, O Heauenly Father, for whome I make my moste moane, but for those silly ones, O Lord, which haue a zeale vnto thee: those I mean, which wold and wish to know thy wil, and yet are letted, holden backe, and blinded by the subtilties of Sathan and his ministers, the wickednes of this wretched worlde, and the sinfull lusts and affections of the flesh. Alas Lord, thou knowest that we be of our selues but flesh, wherein there dwelleth nothing that is good. How then is it possible for man without thee (O Lord) to vnderstand thy trueth indeed? Can the na-

Note.

tural

turall man perceiue the wil of God: (O Lord, to whom thou giuest a zeale of thee, giue them also (we beseech thee) the knowledge of thy blessed will. Suffer not them (O Lord) blindely to be led for to striue against thee: as thou diddest those (Alas) which crucified thine owne Sonne, forgiue them (O Lord) for thy deere Sonnes sake, for they knowe not what they do. They do think (Alas, O Lord) for lack of knowledge, that they do vnto thee good seruice euen when against thee they do moste extremelye rage. Remember O Lord (we beseech thee) for whome thy martyr Stephen did praye, and whom thyne holy Apostle Paule did so truely and earnestlye loue: that for their saluation, hee wished himself accursed for them. Remember (O heauenly Father) the prayer of thy deere sonne, our Sauiour Christe vpon ỹ crosse when he saide vnto thee: O father forgiue them, they know not what they do. With this forginenes, O good Lord, giue me, I beseech thee, thy grace, so heer brefly to set forth the sayings of thy Sonne our Sauiour Christe, and of his Euangelistes, and of his Apostles, that in this aforesaid controuersie, the lighte of the trueth, by the lantern of thy word, maye shine vnto all

them

them that loue thee.

Of the Lords last supper doo speak expreslye the Euangelists, Mathew, Mark, and Luke: but none more plainelye nor more fully declareth the same, then dooth S. Paule, partely in the tenth Chapter, but specially in the xj. chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. As Mathew & Mark doo agree much in woordes, so doo likewise Luke and S. Paule. But all iiij. no doubte, as they were all taught in one schoole, and inspired with one spirit, so taught they al one trueth. God graunt vs to vnderstande it wel. Amen.

Mathew setteth foorth Christes Supper thus.

Math. 26. When euen was come, he sat down with the xij. &c. As they did eat, Iesus took bread and gaue thankes, brake it, and gaue it to the disciples, and saide: Take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup and gaue thanks, gaue it to them, saying: Drink ye al of this: for this is my blood of the new Testament that is shed for many for the remission of sinnes, I say vnto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine tree, vntill that daye, when I shall drink that newe in my Fathers kingdome. And when they had sayed grace they went out.

Now Mark speaketh it thus: And as they eate, Iesus took Bread, blessed, and brake, and gaue to them and saied, take eate, this is my body. And took the cup gaue thankes, and gaue it to them, and they all Drank of it. And he said vnto them: This is my bloud of the new Testament, which is shed for many. Verily I saye vnto you, I wil drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, vntill that day, that I drink that newe, in the kingdome of God. Mark.14.

Here Mathew and Mark do agrée not only in the matter, but also almoste fully in the forme of wordes. In Mathew, gaue thankes. Mark hath one worde, Blessed: which signifieth in this place all one. And where Mathew saith: Drink ye al of this, Mark saith: they al drank of it. And where Mathew saith: of this fruite of the vine: Mark leaueth out the word this and saith: of the fruit of the Vine.

Now let vs sée likewise, what agrée- Luke.22.
ment (in forme of wordes) is betwéne S. Luke and S. Paule.

Luke writeth thus.

He took Bread, gaue thankes, brake it and gaue it to the, saying: this is my body which is giuen for you, this doo in remembrance of me. Likewise also when they had supped, he

took

took the Cup, saying, this Cup is the newe Testament in my bloud, whiche is shedde for you.

Saint Paule setteth forth the Lords Supper thus.

The Lord Iesus, the same night, in the which he was betraied, took Bread, & gaue
1. Cor. 11. thankes and brake, and saide: take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you. This doo in remembrance of me. After the same maner he took the Cup, when supper was doon, saying: this Cup is the new testament in my blood. This doo as often as yee shall drink it in remembrance of me. For as often as yee shall eate this breade, and drinke this Cuppe: yee shall shewe the Lords deathe, vntill he come.

Here where S. Luke saith, which is giuen: Paule saith, which is broken. And as Luke addeth to the wordes of Paule spoken of the Cup which is shed for you, so likewise Paule addeth to the wordes therof, this doo, as often as yee shall drinke it in remembrance of me. The rest that followeth in S. Paule both there and in the tenth Chapter, perteineth vnto the right vse of the Lords Supper.

Thus the Euangelistes and S. Paule haue rehearsed the wordes and worke of

Christe

Chriſte, whereby he did inſtitute and ordaine this holy Sacrament of his bodye and blood to be a perpetuall remembrance vnto his comming againe of him ſelfe, I ſay that is of his body giuen for vs, and of his blood ſhed for the remiſſion of ſinnes. But this remembrance which is thus ordained, as the author thereof is Chriſte, bothe God and man, ſo by the almightye power of God, it far paſſeth all kindes of remembrances, that any other man is able to make either of him ſelfe, or of any other thinge. For whoſoeuer receiueth this holy Sacrament thus ordeined in remembrance of Chriſte, he receiueth therwith either death or life. In this (I truſt) we all agree. For S. Paule ſaith of the godly receiuers in the tenth Chapter of his firſt Epiſtle vnto the Corinthians: The Cup of bleſſinge, which we bleſſe, is it not the partaking or felowſhip of Chriſts blud? And alſo he ſaithe: the Breade whiche wee breake (and meaneth at the Lords Table) Is it not the partaking or felowſhip of chriſts body? Now the partaking of Chriſtes body and of his blood vnto the faithfull and godly, is the partaking or felowſhip of life and immortalitie. And againe of the bad and vngodly receiuers, S. Paule as plain-

Note. ly saith thus. He that eateth of this bread, and drinketh of this Cup vnworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

O how necessary then it is, if we loue life, and would eschue death, to trye and examine our selues before we eate of this bread, and drink of this cup, for he assuredly, he that eateth and drinketh thereof vnworthily: eateth and drinketh his owne damnation, because he discerneth not the Lords body that is, he reuerenceth not the Lordes bodye with the honour that is due vnto him.

And that which was saide, that with the receite of the holye Sacrament of the blessed body and blud of Christe is receiued of euery one good and bad either life or death: it is not meant, that they which are dead before God, may herby receiue life: or the liuinge before God, can herby receiue death.

For as none is meete to receiue naturall food, wherby the natural life is nourished, except he be borne and liue before: so no man can feed (by the receit of this holy Sacrament) of the food of eternall life, except he be regenerated and borne of God before. And on the other side, no man herb receiueth damnation, which is not dead

before.

before. Thus hethertoo without al doubt, God is my witnesse I saye so far as I doo knowe, there is no controuersie amonge them that be learned, in the Churche of England (concerninge the matter of this sacrament) but all doo agrée, whether they be new or olde, and to speak plain, and as some of them doo odiously cal either other whether they be Protestantes, Papistes Pharisies or gospellers. And as all doo agree hithertoo, in the aforesaid doctrine: so all doo deteste, abhorre and condemne the wicked heresie of the Messalonians which otherwise be called Eutichets, which saide that the holy Sacrament can neither doo no good nor harme. All doo also condemne those wicked Anabaptistes, which put no difference betwéen the Lords Table and the Lords meat, and their owne. And because charity would, that we should, (if it be possible, and so far as we may with the sauegarde of good conscience, and maintenance of the trueth) agrée with all men: therfore me thinkes it is not charitablye doo to burthen any man (either newe or olde, as they call them) further, then such doo declare thēselues, to dissent from that we are perswaded to be trueth, or pretend thertoo to be controuersies, where as none

such are in deede: and so to multiply the debate, the which the more it doth increase the further it doth departe from the vaine, that the true Christian should desire.

What it is to lye.

And again this is true, that truth nother needeth nor will be maintained with lies. It is also a true prouerb, That it is euen sinne to lye vpon the deuil. For though by thy lye thou dost neuer so much speak against the deuil, yet in that thou lieſt in deede thou worketh the deuils worke, thou dost him seruice, & takeſt the deuills part.

The slaunderous lyes of the Papists.

Now whether then they do godlye and charitablye, which either by their pen in writing, or by their wordes in preaching, do beare the simple people in hand, that those which thus do teach and beleue, do goe about to make the holye Sacrament (ordeined by Christe himselfe) a thing no better then a peece of common bread: or that do saye, that such do make the holye Sacrament of the blessed bodye and blod of Christe, nothing els but a bare signe or a figure, to represent Christe none otherwise, then the Jaye bushe doth represent the wine in a Tauern, or as a vile person gorgiouslye apparailed, maye represent a King or a Prince in a playe. Alas let men leaue lying, and speak truethy euerye one,

one

one, not only to his neighbour: but alſo of his neighboure, for we are members one of an other ſaith Saint Paule. The controuerſie (no doubt) which at this daye troubleth the Church (wherin any mean learned man, either olde or newe, doth ſtand in) is not, whether the holy Sacrament of the body and blod of Chriſte, is no better then a peece of common breade or no: or whether the Lords table is no more to be regarded, the the table of any earthly man or no: or whether it is but a bare ſigne or figure of Chriſte & nothing els or no. For all do graunt, that S. Paules wordes do require, that the bread which we break, is the partaking of the body of Chriſte, and alſo do graunte him that eateth of that bread, or drinketh of that cup unworthely, to be gilty of the Lords death, and to eate and drinke his owne damnation, becauſe he eſteemeth not the Lords body. All do graunt, that theſe wordes of S. Paule, (when he ſaith: If we eate, it aduantageth vs nothing: or if wee eate not, wee want nothing therby.) are not ſpoken of the Lords table, but of other common meats.

Wherin the controuerſie conſiſteth.

Thus then hetherto yet, we all agree. But now let vs ſee, wherin the diſſention doth ſtand. The vnderſtanding of it, wher-

in it chéefly standeth, is a stey to the true searching for the of the trueth. For who can seeke well a remedye, if he knowe not before the disease? It is neither to be denied nor dissembled, that in the matter of this Sacrament there be diuers poyntes, wherin men (counted to be learned) cánot agrée. As, whether there be any transubstantiation of the bread, or no: any corporall and carnall presence of Christes substance, or no. Whether adoration (due onlyvnto God) is to be don vnto the Sacrament or no: and whether Christes bodye be there offered in déed vnto the heauenly Father, by the Préeste or no: and whether the euill man receiueth the naturall body of Christe or no. Yet neuertheles as in a man diseased in diuers partes, commonly the originall cause of such diuers diseases which is spred abroad in the body, dooth cõe from one chéefe member, as from the stomacke, or from the head, euen so all fiue aforesaid doo chéefly hange vpon this one question, which is, What is the matter of the Sacrament? whether is it the naturall substance of bread, or the natural substãce of Christs owne body? The trueth of this question truelye tried out and agreed vpon, no doubt shall cease the controuersie

in

in all the reſt. For if it be Chriſtes owne natural body, born of the Virgin: then aſſuredlye (ſeing that all learned men in England ſo far as I knowe, bothe newe and olde, graunt there to be but one ſubſtance, then I ſay, they muſt nedes graunt Tranſubſtantiation: that is, a change of the ſubſtance of breade, into the ſubſtance of Chriſtes bodye. Then alſo they muſt nedes graunt the carnal and corporal preſence of Chriſtes body. Then muſt the ſacrament be adored with the honour due to Chriſte him ſelfe, for the vnitie of the two natures in one perſon. Then if the preeſt do offer the Sacrament, he doth offer indeed Chriſte him ſelf. And finally the murtherer, ỹ aduouterer, or wicked man receiuinge the Sacrament, muſte nedes then receiue alſo the naturall ſubſtance of Chriſtes owne bleſſed bodye, bothe fleſhe and blood.

Now on the other ſide, if after the trueth ſhalbe truely tried out, it ſhall be found, that the ſubſtance of breade is the naturall ſubſtance of the Sacrament, although for the change of the vſe, office and dignitie of the bread, the bread indeed ſacramentally is changed into the bodye of Chriſte, as the water in Baptiſme is ſa-

cramentically changed into the fountaine of regeneration, and yet the natural substance therof remaineth al one, as was before: if I saye the true solucion of that former question (wherupon all these controversies dow hang) be, that the natural substance of bread, is the materiall substance in the Sacrament of Christes blessed body: then must it nedes followe of the former proposition (confessed of al that be named to be learned, so far as I dow knowe, in England) why che is that there is but one materiall substance in the Sacrament of the body, & one only likewise in the sacrament of the blod, that there is no such thinge indede and in truethe, as they call Transubstantiation: for the substance of bread remaineth stil in the Sacrament of the body, then also the naturall substance of Christes humain nature, which he took of ỹ Virgin Mary is in heauen, where it reigneth now in glory, and not her inclosed vnder the forme of bread, then ỹ godly honour, which is onely due vnto God the creator, may not be don vnto the creature without idolatrye and sacrilege, is not to be don vnto the holye Sacrament.

Then also the wicked, I mean the impenitent murtherer, aduouterer, or suche

like, doo not receiue the naturall substãce of the blessed body and blood of Christe. Finally, then dooth it followe, that Christes blessed body and blood, which was once onlye offred and shed vpon the crosse, beinge auaylable for the sinnes of all the whole world, is offered vp no more, in the naturall substance therof, nother by the prẽest, nor any other thing. But hœr before wee go any further to search in this matter, & to wade (as it were) to search and trye out (as we may) the trueth hœrof in the scripture, it shall doo well by the way to know whether they that thus make answere and solucione vnto the former principall question, doo take away simply and absolutely the presence of Christes bodye and blood, from the Sacrament ordeined by Christe, and dulye ministred according to his holy ordinance and institution of the same. Undoubtedly they doo deny that vtterlye, either so to saye, or so to meane. Hœrof if any man doo or will doubt, the bookes which are written alreadye in this matter of them, that thus doo answere, will make the matter plaine.

Now then will you saye, what kinde of presence doo they graunt, and what doo they denye? Brẽeflye they deny the pre-

 sence

sence of Christs body in the naturall substance of his humain and assumpt nature, and graunt the presence of the same by grace: that is, they affirme and saye, that the substance of the naturall body e and blood of Christe is only remaining in heauen, and so shall be vnto the latter daye, when he shall come againe in glorye, (accompanied with the Angels of heauen) to iudge both the quicke and the deade. And that the same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christe, because it is vnited vnto the deuine nature in Christe the second person of the Trinitie. Therfore it hath not onely life in it selfe, but is also able to giue and dooth giue life vnto so many as be or shalbe partakers therof, that is, that to all that doo beléeue on his name, which are not borne of blood (as S. Iohn saith) or of the will of the fleshe, or of the will of man, but are borne of God: though the selfsame substance abide still in heauen, and they for the time of their pilgrimage dwel héer vpō earth: by grace I say, that is, by [illegible] life mēcioned in Iohn and the properties of the same, méete for our pilgrimage héer vpon earth, the same body of Christe is héere present with vs. Euen as for example, wee saye, the same

Sunne

Sunne (which in ſubſtance) neuer remoueth his place out of the Heauens, is yet preſent hær by his beams, light and naturall influence, where it ſhineth vpon the earth. For Gods word and his ſacramẽts be (as it were the beams of Chriſt, which is Sol iuſtitiæ, the Sunne of righteouſnes.

Thus haſt thou heard, of what ſort or ſect ſoeuer thou be, wherin doth ſtand the principall ſtate and chéef poynte of all the controuerſies, which dw properly pertain vnto the nature of this Sacrament. As for the vſe therof I graunt there be many other thinges, wherof hær I haue ſpoken nothing at all. And nowe leaſte thou iuſtely mightеſt complain, and ſay, that I haue in openinge of this matter don nothing els, but digged a pitte, and haue not ſhut it vp again: or broken a gap, and haue not made it vp again: or opened the booke, and haue not cloſed it again: or els to call me what thou liſteſt, as neuerall diſſembler, or what ſoeuer els thy luſt and learning ſhall ſerue thée to name me wordſſe: Therfore hær now I wil (by Gods grace) not only ſhortly but ſo clærely and plainly as I can make thée to knowe, whether of the aforeſaid two anſwers to ỳ former principall ſtate and chéef poynt doth like

me best: yea and also I will holde all those accursed, whiche in this matter that now so troubleth the Church of Christ haue of God receiued the keye of knowledge, and yet goe about to shut vp the doores so that they themselues will not enter in nor suffer other that woulde. And as for mine owne parte, I consider but of late what charge and cure of soule hath bin committed vnto me, whereof God knoweth, how soon I shalbe called to giue accounte: and also now in this worlde what perill and danger of the lawes concerning my life I am now in at this present time. What folly were it then for me, now to dissemble with God, of whom assuredly I looke and hope by Christe to haue euerlasting life? Seing that such charge and danger bothe before God and man, doo compasse mee in round about on euery side: therefore God willing I will frankly and freelye vtter my minde, and thoughe my bodye be captiue, yet my tung & my pen as long as I may shall freely set forth, ỹ which vndoubtedlye I am perswaded to be the trueth of Godes worde. And yet I will doo it vnder this protestation, call me protestant who liketh, I passe not therof. My protestation shall be thus: that my minde is and e-

ver

ner shalbe (God willinge) to set forth sincerelye the true sence and meaninge (to the beste of my understanding) of Godes moste holy worde, and not to decline from the same, either for feare of worldly danger, or els for hope of gaine.

I do protest also due obedience and submission of my iudgemente in this my writing, and in all other mine affairs vnto those of Christes Church, which be truly learned in Gods holy worde, gathered in Christs name and guided by his spirit. After this protestation, I do plainely affirme and say, that the second question and principall poynt, I am perswaded to be the very true meaning and sence of Gods holy worde: that is, that the naturall substance of bread and wine is the true materiall substance of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our Saviour Christe: and the places of scripture wherupon this my faith is grounded, be these, both concerning the sacrament of the body and also the blood.

Answere to the cheef question.

Firste let vs repete the beginninge of the institution of the Lords supper wherin all the three Euangelists, and S. Paule almost in wordes do agree, saying that Iesus took bread, gaue thanks, brake, and gaue

it

it to the Disciples sayinge: Take,eate,this is my bodye.

Hær it appeareth plainly,that Christe calleth very bread his body. For ỳ which he took,was very bread. In this all men dw agrée. And that which he took,after he had giuen thankes,he brake:and ỳ which he tok and brake,he gaue to his disciples and that which he took,brake,and gaue to his Disciples he saide him selfe of it: This is my body. So it appeareth plainelye that Christ called very bread his body. But very bread can not be his bodye in very substance therof:therfore it must néds haue an other meaning. Which meaninge appeareth plainelye what it is, by the next sentence that folowth immediatly, both in Luke and in Paule. And that is this. Doo this in remembrance of me. Wherupon it sæmeth vnto me to be euident,that Christe did take bread,and called it his bodye,for that he would thereby institute a perpetuall remembrance of his body:specially of the singuler benefite of our redemtion,which he would thē procure and purchase vnto vs by his bodye vpon the crosse. But bread retaining still his owne very naturall substance, may be thus by grace, (and in a sacramental signification his

his body: wheras els the very bread which he tok brake, and gaue them, could not be in any wise his naturall bodye. For that were confusiō of substances, and therfore the very wordes of Christe ioyned with the nert sentence folowing, both enforceth vs to confesse the verye bread, to remaine still, and also openeth vnto vs, how that bread maye be and is thus by his deuine power his body, which was giuen for vs. But hēre I remēber I haue red in some writers of the contrarye opinion, which Christe did take, he brake. For say they after his taking, he blessed it as Mark doth speak. And by his blessing, he changed the natural substance of the bread into the natural substance of his body: & so although he tok the bread, and blessed it, yet because in blessing he changed the substance of it, he brake not the breade, which then was not there, but only the forme therof.

Vnto this obiection I haue two plain answers, both grounded vpō Gods word. The one I wil hēr rehearse, the other answer I wil differ, vntil I speak of ỹ sacramēt of ỹ blod. Mine answere hēr is take out of the plaine wordes of S. Paule which doth manifestly confound this fantastical inuention, first inuented (I wēn) of Pope

Innocen-

Innocentius, and after confirmed by the subtile sophister Duns, & lately renewed now in our daies, with an eloquent stile & much fineneſſe of wit. But what can crafty inuention, subtiltye in sophiſmes, eloquence or fineneſſe of wit preuaile against the vnfallible worde of God? what nede we to striue and contend what thinge we breake, for Paule saieth, speaking vndoubtedly of the Lords table: The bread (saieth he) which we break, is it not the partaking or felowſhip of the Lords body?

Mar. Antho. Conſtan. Gardenar.

Wherupon it followeth, that after the thãks giuing it is bread which we breake. And how often in the Acts of the Apoſtles is the Lords supper signified by breaking of bread? They did perseuer (saith S. Luke) in the Apoſtles doctrine communion, and breaking of bread. And they brake breade in euery houſe.

Acts. 2. 20.

And again in an other place when they were come together to breake bread, &c. S. Paule which setteth forth moſte fully in his writinge both the doctrine and the right vſe of the Lords supper & the Sacramentall eating and drinkinge of Christs body and blod, calleth it fiue times bread, bread, bread, bread, bread.

The sacramentall bread is the miſti-

call

call body, and so it is called in scripture. 1.Cor.10. as it is called the naturall body of Christe. But Christes misticall body is the congregation of Christians. Now no man was euer so fond, as to say, that that sacramentall breade is transubstantiated and changed into the substance of the congregacione. Wherefore no man shoulde likewise think, or says, that the breade is transubstantiated and changed into the naturall substance of Christes humaine nature. The seconde reason. The third argument.

But my minde is not here to write what may be gathered out of scriptures for this purpose, but onely to note her briefly, those which seem vnto me, to be ỳ most plaine places. Therfore contented to haue spoken thus muche of the Sacramentall bread: I will nowe speake a little of the Lords cup.

And this shall be my third argument grounded vpon Christes owne wordes. The natural substance of the sacramẽtall wine remaineth still, and is the material substance of the sacrament of the blod of Christe: Therfore it is likewise so in the sacramentall bread. The third Argument.

I know that he that is of a contrarye opinion, will denye the former parte of

mine

mine argument. But I wil proue it thus by the plaine wordes of Christe himselfe, both in Mathewe and in Marke. Christes wordes are these after the wordes saide vpon the cup: I say vnto you saith Christe I will not drinke henceforthe of this fruite of the vine tree, vntill I shall drink that new in my fathers kingdome. Here note how Christe calleth plainly his cup the fruit of the vine tree. But the fruit of ỹ the vine is very natural wine. Wherfore the naturall substance of the wine dothe remaine stil in the sacrament of Christes blood.

And heer in speaking of the Lords cup: it commeth vnto my remembrance ỹ vanitie of Innocentius his fantasticall inuention, which by Paules wordes I did confute before, and heer did promise somwhat more to speake, and ỹ is this: if this transubstantiatione be made by this worde, Blessed, in Mark said vpon the breade, as Innocentius that pope did saye: then surely seeing that word is not saide of Christe neither in any of the Euangelistes nor in S Paule vpon the cup: There is no Transubstantiatione of the wine at all. For where the cause doth faile, there can not follow the effect. But ỹ sacramental bread

and

and the ſacramental wine dw both remain in their naturall ſubſtance a like, & if the one be not changed, as of ꝑ ſacramentall wine it appeareth euidently: then there is no ſuch Tranſubſtantiatione in nother of them both.

All that truſt and affirme this change of the ſubſtance of bꝛeade and wine into the ſubſtance of Chꝛiſtes bodye and blod called tranſubſtantiation: dw alſo ſay this change to be made by a certaine fo:me of pꝛeſcripte wo:des, and none other. But what they be that make the change, either of the one, o: of the other: vndoubtedly euen they that dw wꝛite moſte finelye in theſe our daies, almoſt confeſſe plainely, that they can not tel. Fo: althoughe they graunt to certaine of the olde autho:s, as Chriſoſtom, and Ambroſe: ꝑ theſe wo:ds This is my body, are the wo:des of conſecration of the ſacrament of the bodye: yet ſay they, theſe wo:ds may wel be ſo called, becauſe they dw aſſure vs of the conſecration therof, whether it be dwn befo:e theſe wo:ds be ſpoken o: no.

The papiſts affirme they wot not what.

Gardener to the 48. obiection

But as fo: this their doubte, concerning the ſacrament of the bodye, I let it paſſe. Let vs now conſider ꝑ wo:ds which pertain to the cup. This is firſt euident,

that

that as Mathewe much agréeth with Mark, & likewise Luke with Paule muche agréeth hérein in forme of wordes so in the same forme of wordes in Mathew and Mark is diuers from that which is in Luke and Paule: the olde authors do moste rehearse the forme of wordes in Mathewe and Marke: because I wéene they séemed to them moste clére. But hér I would knowe, whether it is credibly or no, that Luke and Paule, when they celebrated the Lordes Supper with their congregations, that they did not vse the same forme of words (at the Lords table) which they wrote, Luke in his Gospell, and Paule in his epistle. Of Luke, because he was a Physition, whether some will graunt, that he might be a Prieste or no, and was able to receiue ỹ order of préesthood, which (they say) is giuen by the vertue of these wordes saide by the Bishop: Take thou authoritye to Sacrifice for the quick and the deade. I can not tell, but if they shoulde be so straight vpon Luke either for his crafte, or els for lack of such power giuen him by vertue of the aforesaid wordes: then I wéene, both Peter and Paule are in danger to be deposed of their préesthood, for the craft either of fishings,

Peter and Paule had no such preesthood as the Papists haue.

which

which was Peters: or making of tentes, which was Paules, were more vile, then the science of Phisicke.

And as for those sacramentall words of the order of Priesthood, to have authoritie to sacrifice both for the quicke and the deade, I wene Peter and Paule (if they were both aliue) were not able to proue, that euer Christe gaue them such authoritie, or euer said any such wordes vnto them. But I will let Luke goe, and because Paule speaketh more for him selfe: I will rehearse his wordes: That (saith Paule) whiche I receiued of the Lord, I gaue vnto you. For the Lorde Iesus, &c. And so he setteth forth the whole institution and right vse of the Lordes Supper. Now seeing that S. Paule heer saith, that which he receiued of the Lord, he had giuen them, and that whiche he hath receiued and giuen them before by word of mouth: now he rehearseth and writeth the same in his Epistle, is it credible that Paule woulde neuer vse this forme of wordes, vpon the Lords cup, which (as he saith) he receaued of the Lord, that he had giuen them before, and now rehearseth in his Epistle? I trust no man is so far from al reason, but he wil graunt me, that this is

not likely so to be.

Nowe then, if you graunte mee, that Paule did vse the forme of wordes, which he writeth: Let vs then rehearse and consider Paules wordes, which he saith, Christ spake thus vpon the Cuppe.

This Cup is the new Testament in my blood, this doo as often as ye shall drinke it in the remembrance of me.

Hær I woulde knowe, whether that Christs wordes spoken vpon the cup were not as mighty in worke, and as effectuall in signification to all intentes, constructions, and purposes, (as all our parliament men doo speak) as they were spoken vpon the breade. If this be graunted, which thinge I think no man can deny: then further I reason thus. But the worde (Is) in the wordes spoken vpon the Lords breade doth mightely signifie (say they) ỳ change of the substance of ỳ which goeth before it into the substance of that which followeth after, that is, of the substance of bread into the substance of Christes bodye, when Christe saith: This is my body. Now then if Christs wordes which are spoken vpon the cup, which Paule hære rehearseth be of ỳ same might and power, both in working and signifying: then must this worde

(Is)

(Is) when Christe saithe: This Cup is the new Testament, &c. turne the substance of the cup into the substance of the new testament. And if thou wilt saye, that this worde (Is) nother maketh nor signifieth any such change of the cup, Although it be said of Christe, that this cup is the newe testament, yet Christ ment no such thinge as that. Marry sir, euen so saye I, when Christe said of the bread, which hee toke and after thanks giuen, brake, and gaue them, saying: Take, eat, this is my body, he ment no more any such change of the substance of breade into the substance of his naturall body, then he ment of the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of the newe Testament. And if thou wilt saye that the word (Cup) heer in Christs words doth not signifie the Cup it self, but the wine or thing conteined in the cup, by a figure called Metonymia, for that Christs wordes so ment, and muste nedes be taken: thou saist very wel. But I pray thee by ỹ way, heer note two things First that this worde, Is, hath no suche strength or signification in the Lordes words, to make or to signifie any transubstanciation. Secondly, that the Lords words wherby he instituted the sacra-

Note well the Papists errour confuted.

ment of his blood: he vseth a figuratiue speach. How vaine then is it, that some so earnestly doo say, as it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the instituti- of the sacraments, Christe vsed no figurs, but all his woordes are to be strained to their proper significations: when as heer what soeuer thou saiest was in the cup, nother that nor the cupit self, taking euerye woorde in his proper signification, was ẏ new testament, but in vnderstanding that which was in the cup by ẏ cup that is a figuratiue speache: yea and also thou canst not verifie or truly say of that whether thou saiest it was wine or Christs bloud, to be the new testament without a figure also. Thus in one sentence spoken of Christe, in the institution of the Sacrament of his bloud, the figure must helpvs twise. So vntrue it is, that some doo write, that Christe vseth no figure in the doctrine of faith, nor in the institution of his sacraments. But some say, if we shall thus admit figures in doctrine: then shall all the articles of our faith, by figures and allegories shortly be transformed and vnlosed. I say it is like fault, and euen the same, to denye the figure, where the place so requirethe to be

vnderstanded

vnderstanded, as vainly to make it a figuratiue speach, whiche is to be vnderstanded in his proper signification. Aug. de doc Christiana. li. 3. ca. 16.

The rules whereby the speech is knowen, when it is figuratiue, and whereby it is none. Saint Augustine in his booke. De doctrina Christiana, giueth diuers learned lessons, very necessary to be knowen of the students in Gods worde. Of the which, one I wil rehearse, which is this: If (saith he) The scripture dooth seeme to commaund a thing, which is wicked or vngodly, or to forbid a thing that charitie doth require: then know, saith he, that the speach is figuratiue. And for example, he bringeth the saying of Christe, in the vi. chapter of S. Iohn. Except ye eate of the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood: ye can not haue life in you, it seemeth to commaund a wicked or an vngodly thing, wherfore it is a figuratiue speech, commaunding to haue Communion and felowship with Christs passion, and deuoutly and holsomly to lay vp in memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs. Gardiner in his answers to the 161. & 226. obiection.

And heer I can not but meruail at some men, surely of much excellent fineneſſe of wit, & of great eloquence, that are not ashamed to write and saye, that this afore- Note.

said saying of Christe is after S. Austine a figuratiue speache indeede: howbeit not vnto the learned, but to the vnlearned. Heere let any man that but indifferently vnderstandeth the Latin tongue, reade the place in S: Austine: and if ye perceiue not clerly S. Augustins wordes, and mine to be contrarye, let me abide thereof the rebuke.

This lesson of S. Augustine I haue therefore the rather set forthe, because it teacheth vs to vnderstand that place in Iohn figuratiuely. Euen so surely the same lesson with the example of S. Augustins expositions therof, teacheth vs not onlye by the same, to vnderstand Christes wordes in the Institution of the Sacrament both of his body & of his blod figuratiuely, but also the very trewe meaning and vnderstandinge of the same. For if to commaunde to eate the flesshe of the sonne of man, and to drinke his blode, semeth to commaund an inconuenience and an vngodlines, and is euen so indeed, if it be vnderstanded as the wordes do stande in their proper signification: and therfore must be vnderstanded figuratiuelye and spiritually, as S. Augustine doth good and learnedly interprete them: then sure

ly Chriſte commaunding in his laſt Supper to eat his body and drinke his blode, ſæmed to commaund in ſound of wordes as grace and euen the ſame inconuenience and vngodlynelle, as did his wordes in the vi. of S. Iohn: and therefore muſt euen by the ſame reaſon, be likewiſe vnderſtanded and expounded figuratiuely and ſpiritually, as S. Auguſtine did the other. Wherunto that expoſition of S. Auguſtine may ſæme to be the more meete, for that Chriſte in his ſupper, tothe commaundement of eating and drinkinge of his body and blod, addeth: Doo this in remembrance of me. Which wordes ſurelye were the keye that opened and reuealed the ſpirituall and godlye expoſition vnto Saint Auguſtine.

But I haue taried longer in ſettinge forth the forme of Chriſtes wordes vpon the Lordes cup, written by Paule & Luke that I did intend to doo. And yet in ſpeaking of the forme of Chriſtes wordes, ſpoken vpon his cup, commeth now to my remembrance the forme of wordes vſed in the Latin Maſſe, vpon the Lords cup. Wherof I doo not a little meruaile, what ſhould be the cauſe, ſæing the latin Maſſe agræeth with the Euangeliſts and Paule, in

The Lords cup as the preeſts ſay.

in the forme of wordes laid vpon the bread why in the wordes laide vpon the Lordes cup, it differeth from them all, yea and addeth to the wordes of Chriſte ſpoken vpon the cup theſe wordes, Miſterium fidei, that is, the miſterie of faithe, whiche are not red to be attributed vnto the Sacrament of Chriſtes blod, nother in ỳ Euangeliſts, nor in Paule, nor ſo far as I know in any other place of holye Scripture, yea and if it may haue ſome good expoſitione, yet why it ſhould not be as wel added vnto the wordes of Chriſte vpon his bread, as vpon his Cup, ſurelye I do not ſee the miſterie. And becauſe I ſee in the vſe of the Latin Maſſe, the Sacramente of the blod abuſed, when it is denyed vnto the laye people, cleane contrarye vnto Gods moſte certain worde: for why, I do beſeech thee, ſhould the ſacrament of Chriſts blod be denied vnto the lay chriſtiã more then to the Prieſte? Did not Chriſte ſhed his blod aſwel for the lay godlye man, as for the godlye Prieſte? If thou wilt ſaye, yes that he did ſo. But the ſacrament of the blod is not to be receiued without the offeringe vp and ſacrificinge thereof vnto God the Father, bothe for the quicke and for the dead: and no man may make obla-

tion of Chriſts blod vnto God but a prieſt and therfore the prieſt alone, and that but in his Maſſe only, may receiue the ſacrament of the blod. And call you this, Maiſters, Myſterium fidei?

Alas, alas, I feare me, this is before God, Miſterium iniquitatis, the miſtery of iniquitie, ſuch as S. Paule ſpeaketh of, in his epiſtle to the Theſſalonians. The Lord be mercifull vnto vs, and bleſſe vs, lighte his countenance vpon vs, and be merciful vnto vs. That we may know thy waye vpon earthe, and amonge all people thy ſaluation. 2. Theſ. 2. Praier. Pſal. 67.

This kinde of oblation ſtandeth vpon Tranſubſtantiation his coſin germaine, and they dw grow both vpon one ground. The Lord wæde it out of his Viniarde hortlye, if it be his bleſſed will and pleaſure, that bitter rot. To ſpeake of this oblatione, howe muche is it iniurious vnto Chriſtes paſſion? The Maſſe ſacrifice iniurious to Chriſtes paſſion.

How? it can not, but with highe blaſphemy and hainous arrogancy, and intolerable pride, be claimed of any man, other then of Chriſte him ſelfe: how muche and how plainly it repugneth vnto the manifeſt wordes, the trueſence & meaning of holy ſcripture in many places, eſpecially in ỹ

thæ

theepistle to ỳ Hebrewes: the matter it is so long, & other haue writen in it at large, that my minde is nowe, not to intreate therof any further.

For only in this my scribling, I intend to search out and set forthe by the Scriptures (according to Godes gracious gifte of my poore knowledge) whether the true sence and meaninge of Christes wordes in the institution of his holye supper, do require any Transubstantiation, as they cal it: or that the very substance of breade and wine do remaine still in the Lordes supper & be the materiall substance of the holy sacramente of Christe our Sauiours blessed bodye and blode. Yet there remaineth one vaine Quidditie of Duns in this matter, the whiche because some that write nowe do seme to like it so well that they haue stripped hym out of Dunces dusty and darke termes, and pricked him and painted him in freshe coloures of an eloquent stile: and may therfore deceaue the more excepte the errour be warely eschewed.

Gardener in the answere to the 15. obiection.

Duns saith in these wordes of Christe, This is my bodye, this pronowne demonstratiue, meaninge the worde (This) if ye will knowe, what it doth showe or de-

monstrate

monſtrate whether the breade that Chriſt tok or no: he anſwereth no, but onely one thing in ſubſtance it paintethe, whereof the nature or name it dothe not tell, but leaueth that to be determined and told by that which followeth ỳ word Is, that is by Prædicatum, as the Logician doth ſpeake: and therfore he calleth this pronowne demonſtratiue (This) Individuum vagum that is, a wandring proper name, wherby we maye poynte out and ſhewe anye one thing in ſubſtance, what thinge ſoeuer it be. That this imaginatione is vaine and vntruelye applyed vnto theſe wordes of Chriſte. This is my bodye: it may appeare plainely in the wordes of Luke and Paule ſaid vpon the cup, conferred with ỳ forme of wordes ſpoken vpon ỳ cup in Mathewe and Marke. For as vpon the breade it is ſaid of all. This is my bodye: ſo of Mathew and Mark, it is ſaide vpon the cup: This is my blood. Then if in the wordes, This is my body, the worde (This) be as Duns calleth it, a wandringe name to appoynte and ſhewe forth any one thing, whereof the name and nature it dothe not tell: ſo muſte it be likewiſe in thoſe wordes of Mathewe and Marke vpon the Lords cup This is my blode. But in the wordes of

Marthewe

Mathdw & Mark, it ſignifieth & poynteth out the ſame ỹ it doth in ỹ Lords wordes vpon the cup in Luke and Paule, where it is ſaid: This cup is the new Teſtamente in my blood, &c. Therefore in Mathewe and Marke the pronown demonſtratiue (this) dothe not wander to poynte onelye one thing in ſubſtance, not ſhewinge what it is, but tellethe it plainelye what it is, no leſſe in Mathewe and Marke vnto the eye then is don in Luke and Paule, by putting to this word (cup) both vnto the eye, and vnto the eare. For taking the cup and demonſtrating or ſhewing it vnto his diſciples, by this pronowne demonſtratiue, (this) and ſaying vnto them, Drink ye all of this: it was then all one to ſaye. This is my blood, as to ſaye: This cup is my blood meaninge by the cup as the nature of the ſpeach doth require: the thinge conteined in the cup. So likewiſe without a doubt, when Chriſte had taken breade, giuen thanks, and broken it, and giuing it to his diſciples, ſaid, Take: and ſo demonſtrating and ſhewing that bread which hee had in his handes, to ſaye then, This is my body: and to haue ſaide, This bread is my body.

As it were all one, if a man lackinge a knife, and going to his oſſers, would ſay

vnto

vnto an other, whom he saw to haue two kniues. Sir I praye you lend mée the one of your kniues. Were it not now all one to answere him, Sir, holde I will lende you this to eat your meat, but not to opē oisters withall: and holde, I wil lend you this knife to eate your meat but not to open oysters. This similitude serueth but for this purpose, to declare the nature of speach withall, where as the thinge that is demonstrated and shewed, is euidently perceiued, and openly knowen to the eye.

But O good Lord, what a wonderfull thing is it to sée, how some men doo labour to teach, what is demonstrated and shewed by the pronowne demonstratiue (this) in Christes woordes when he saieth: This is my body: This is my blood: how they labour (I saye) to teache, what that (This) was then indéede, when Christe spake in the beginning of the sentence the woorde (This) before he had pronounced the reste of ẏ woords, that folowed in the same sentence: so that their doctrine maye agrée with their Transubstantiation: which indéed is the verye foundation, wherein al their erronione doctrine dooth stande. And héere the Transubstantiatours doo not agrée amonge them selues, no more then they

Gard. to th 130. biectio

God make agree not among the selues.

they do in the wordes which wrought the Transubstantiatione, when Christe did first institute his Sacrament: wherin Innocentius a Bishop of Rome of the latter daies, and Duns (as was noted before) do attribute the worke vnto the word (Benedixit) Blessed: but the rest for the moste parte, to Hoc est corpus meum. This is my body, &c. Duns therefore with his secte, because he putteth the change before must nedes say, that this, when Christe spake it in the beginning of the sentence, was in déed Christes body. For in the change, the substance of bread did depart, and ỹ chãge was now don in Benedixit (saith he) that went before: and therfore after him e his that (this) was then indéed Christes body, though the word did not import so muche but onely one thinge in substance: whiche substance after Duns (the breade beinge gone) must nedes be ỹ substance of Christs body. But they ỹ put their Transubstantiation to be wrought by these wordes of Christe. This is my bodye: and do say, that when ỹ whole sentence was finished then this change was perfected and not before: they can not say, but yet Christes (this) in the beginning of the sentence before the other wordes were fully pronoũced, was

breed

bread in dede. But as yet the change was not donn, and so long the bread must nedes remain, and so longe with the vniuersall consent of al transubstantiatours, the naturall substance of Christes body can not come: and therfore must their (this) of necessitye demonstrate and shewe the substance, which was as yet in the pronouncing of the first word this by Christe, but bread. But how can they make and verifie Christs wordes to be true, demonstrating the substance which in ỳ demonstration is but bread, and say therof, This is my body, that is as they saye the natural substance of Christs body: except they would say, that the verbe, Is, signifieth, is made, or, is changed into. And so then if the same verbe, Is, be of that same effect in Christs wordes spoken vpon the cup, and rehearsed by Luke and Paule: the cup or the wine in the Cup muste bee made or turned into the newe Testamente, as was declared before.

Gardenar an euttrall or lack of both sides.

There be soms amonge the Transubstantiatours, which walke so wilily and so warely betwen these two aforesaid opinions, allowing them both, and holding plainelye nother of them bothe, that me thinks they may be called Neutrals, Amboderters

boderers, or rather suche as can shift on both sides. They play on both partes. For with the later, they dw allow the doctrine of the last sillable, which is that transubstantiatione is dwne by miracle in an instant, at the sound of the last sillable (um) in this sentẽce, Hoc est corpus meum. And they dw allowe also Duns his fantastical imaginatione of Indiuidium vagum, that demonstrateth as he teacheth in Christes wordes, one thing in substance, then being (after his minde) the substance of the body of Christe.

A meruailous thinge, how one man can agrée with both these two, they being so contrary the one to the other. For the one saithe, the wordes this, demonstrateth the substance of bread: and the other saith no not so, the bread is gone, and it demonstrateth a substance whiche is Christes body.

Gard. to the 4. obiection.

Tushe saith this thirde man, yée vnderstand nothing at all. They agrée well inough in the chéef poynte, whiche is the ground of all: that is, bothe dw agrée and beare witnes, that there is transubstantiation. They dw agrée in déed in that conclusion: I graunt. But their procesle and doctrine thereof dw euen allwell agrée to geather

God makers agree against the trueth. Note.

ther as did the false witnes before Annas & Caiphas against Christ: or the two wicked Iudges against Susanna. For against Christe the false witnesses did agree no doubt to speak all against him. And the wicked iudges were both agreed to condemne poore Susanna: but in examination of their witnesses, they dissented so far that al was found false that they went about, both that wherin they agreed, and also those thinges, which they brought for their proofes.

The consent of the olde authors.

Thus muche haue I spoken, in searchinge out a solucione for this principall question, which was, what is ỳ materiall substance of the holye Sacramente in the Lords supper? Now least I should seem to set by mine owne conceite, more then is mete: or lesse to regard the doctrine of the old ecclesiasticall writers, then is conuenient for a man of my poore learning and simple wit for to do. And because, also I am indeed perswaded, that the olde ecclesiastical writers vnderstod the true meaning of Christ in this matter: e haue both so truly and so plainly set it forth in certain places of their writinges, ỳ no man whiche will vouchsafe to reade them, and without preiudice of a corrupt iudgemẽt will

will indifferently weigh them, and cõsider their mindes none otherwise then they declare themselues to haue mente: I am perswaded (I say) that in reading of them thas no man can be ignorant in this matter, but he that wil shut vp his own eies, and blind-fold himself. When I speake of Ecclesiasticall writers, I mean of such as were before the wicked vsurpation of of the sea of Rome was growen so vnmesurably great, that not only with tirannical power, but also with corrupt doctrine, it began to subuert Christes gospell, and to turne the state, that Christe and his Apostles set in ỹ Church, vpside down. For the causes afore saide, I wil rehearse certain of their sayings: ỹ yet because I take thẽ but for witnesses and expounders of this doctrin: not as the authors of ỹ same, and also for that now I wil not be tedious I will rehearse but fewe, that is three olde writers of the Greeke Church, and other three of the Latin Church, which doo seem vnto me to be in this matter most plaine.

The Greek Authors are Origen, Chrisostome, and Theodoret. The Latin, are, Tertulliane, S. Augustine, and Gelasius. I knowe there can be nothinge spoken so plainly, but the crafty wit furnished wõ elo

quence can darken it, & wrest it quite from
ỳ true meaning to a contrary sence. And I
know also that eloquence, craft, and fine-
nes of wit hath gon about to bleare mens
eies, and to stop their eares in the afore-
named writers, that men shoulde nother
heare nor se, what those Authors bothe
write and teache so plainely, that excepte
men shoulde be made both starke blinde,
and deafe: they can not but of necessitie, if
they will rede and way them indifferet-
ly both heare and se what they do meane
when eloquence, craft, and fynenesse of
wit hathe don all that they cou. Now let
us heare the olde writers of the Greeke
Church.

Origene, which lived about 1250. yeres agone: a man for the excellency of his learninge so highlye esteemed in Christes Church, that he was counted and judged the singular teacher in his time of christs religion, the confounder of heresies, the scholmaister of many godly matters, and an opener of highe misteries in scripture. He writing vpon the xv. chapter of Saint Mathewes gospell, saieth thus: But if any thing enter into the mouth it goeth away in to the belly, and is auoided into the draught: Heare and that meate which is sanctified by

Origen. Eccle. Hist. Li. 6. Ca. 3.

the woord of God and praier, concerninge the matter thereof, it goeth awaye into the belly, and is auoided into the draughte But for the praier whiche is added vnto it, for the proportion of the faith, it is made profitable, makinge the minde able to perceiue and see that which is profitable. For it is not the materiall substance of breade, but the woord which is spoken vpon it, that is profitable to the man that eateth it not vnwoorthely. And this I mean of the Typicall and Simbolicall, that is, Sacramentall bodye. Thus far goeth ỹ wordes of Origene, where it is plaine, firste that Origene speaking heer of the sacrament of the Lords supper as the laste wordes do plainely signifie, doth meane and teache, that the materiall substance therof is receiued, digested, and auoided, as the materiall substance of other bread and meats is, which coulde not be, if there were no materiall substance of bread at all, as the fantasticall opinion of transubstantiation doth put. It is a woorld to see the answere of the Papistes to this place of Origen, in the disputations which were in this matter in the Parliamente house and in both ỹ vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxforde, they that defended Transubstantiation said, that this parte

The papists obiection against Origene.

of Origen was but set forthof late by Erasmus, and therefore is to be suspected. But how vaine this their answere is, it appereth plainly. For so maye all the good olde authors, which lay in olde libraries, and are set forth of late, be by this reason reiected, as Clement, Alexandrinus, Theodoret, Iustinus, Ecclesiastica historia, Nicephori, and other such. An other answere they had, saying that Origene is noted to haue erred in some poyntes, and therfore faithe is not to be giue in this matter vnto him. But this answer well waighed doth minister good matter to the cleare confutation of it selfe. For indeed we graunte, that in some poynts Origen did erre. But those errours are gathered out and noted both of S. Ierome and Epiphanius, so that his workes (those errours excepted) are now so much the more of authoritie, that suche great learned men took pains to take out of him. whatsoeuer they thoughte in him to be written amis. But as concerninge this matter of the Lords Supper, nother they nor yet euer any other ancient Author did euer say, that Origen did erre. An other Obiection. Gardener the 166.

Now because these two answers haue bene of late so confuted and confounded, that it is well perceiued, that they will

take no place: therefore some whithe haue written since that time, haue forged two other answers, euen of the same moulde. The former whereof is, that Origen in this place spake not of the Sacramente of bread or wine of the Lords table, but of an other mistical meat: of the which S. Augustine maketh mention to be giuen vnto them, that were taught the faithe, before they were baptised. But Origens owne wordes in two sentēces before rehearsed being put togither, proue this answere vntrue. For he saieth, that he meaneth of that figuratiue and mistical bodye, which profiteth them, that do receiue it worthilye, alludinge so plainelye vnto S. Paules wordes spoken of the Lords supper: that it is a shame for any learned man once to open his mouth to the contrarye. And that breade which S. Augustin speaketh of, he can not proue that any such thing was vsed in Origens time. Yea and though that coulde bee proued, yet was there neuer breade in any time called a sacramentall body, sauing the sacramentall bread of the Lords table, which is called of Origen the typicall and symbolicall body of Christe.

Gardener in the same place.

The second of the two new found answers, is yet moste monstrous of al other

which

which is this. But let vs graunt (say they) that Origen spake of the Lordes supper, and by the matter therof was vnderstanded the materiall substance of bread and wine: what then say they? For thoughe the materiall substance was once gone and departed by reason of Transubstantiation, whils the formes of the bread and the wine did remaine, yet now it is no inconuenience to saye, that as the material substance did departe at the entring in of Christes body vnder th'aforesaid formes so whan the said formes be destroyed and do not remaine, then commeth again the substance of breade and wine.

And this say they, is very mete in this misterye, that that which began with the miracle, shall ende in a miracle.

If I had not red this fantasie I would scarcelye haue beleued, that any learned man ever would haue set forth such a folishe fantasie: which not onelye lacketh al ground, either of Gods worde, reason, or of any ancient writer, but also is cleen contrary to the common rules of schole diuinitie: which is that no miracle is to be affirmed and put without necessitie. And although for their former miracle, which is their transubstantiation, they haue some

colour, though it be but vaine, saying it is done by the power and vertue of these wordes of Christe, This is my body: yet to make this seconde miracle of returninge the materiall substance againe they haue no colour at al. Or els I pray them shew me, by what wordes of Christe is the second miracle wrought.

Thus ye may see, that the sleights and shifts which craft and witte can inuente to wreste the true sence of Origen cannot take place But now let vs heare an other place of Origen, and so we will let him go.

Origene in the eleuen Homile Super Leuiticum saith: that there is also euen in the foure Gospells, and not onelye in the olde Testament, a letter (meaninge a litterall sence) whiche killethe. For if thou followe (saith he) the letter in that sayinge: Excepte ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of Man and drink his blood, &c.

This letter dooth kill. If in that place the letter doth kill, wherin is commaunded the eating of Christs flesh: then surelye in those wordes of Christe, wherein Christe commaundeth vs to eate his bodye, the literall sence therof likewise doth kill. For it is no lesse crime but euen the same and all one in the literall sence, to

eate

eate Chriſtes bodye and to eate Chriſtes
ſleſhe. Wherefore if the one do kill,
excepte it be vnderſtanded figuratiuelye
and ſpirituallye: then the other ſurelye
doth kill likewiſe. But that to eate
Chriſtes fleſhe doth kill ſo vnderſtanded,
Origen affirmeth plainly in his wordes
aboue rehearſed: Wherefore it cannot be
iuſtly denied, but to eate Chriſtes bodye
literally vnderſtanded, muſt nedes after
him kill likewiſe.

The anſwere that is made to this
place of Origen of the papiſts, is ſo foliſh,
that it bewraieth it ſelf, without any fur-
ther confutation. It is the ſame, that they
make to a place of S. Auguſtin in his book Lib. 3. ca. 16.
De doctrinæ Chriſtiana: Whereas S. Au-
guſtine ſpeaketh in effect the ſame thinge
ỹ Origen doth hẽr. The papiſts anſwer
is this: to the carnal man the literal ſence
is hurtfull, but not ſo to the ſpirituall. As
though to vnderſtande that in his proper
ſence, which ought to be taken figuratiue-
ly, were to the carnall man a dangerous
perill: but to the ſpirituall man none
at all.

Now to Chriſoſtome, whom I bringe Chriſoſtom.
for the ſecond witer in the greek Church
He ſpeaking againſt the vnholy vſinge of

mans body, which after S. Paule ought to be kept pure and holy, as the very temple of the holy ghost, saith thus: If it be a fault (saith he) to translate the holy vessels, in the which is conteined not the trewe bodye of Christe, but the mistery of the body, to priuate vses, how much more offence is it to abuse and defile the vessels of our body.

In opere imperfect ho. 9 in Matthe.

These be the wordes of Chrisostome, But I trowe that hér many sowle shifts are deuised, to defeat this place. The Author saith: one is suspected. I answere: but in this place neuer fault was found with him, vnto these our daies. And whether this author was Iohn Chrisostome him selfe the Archbishop of Constantinople or no: that is not the matter. For of all it is graunted, that he was a writer of that age, and a man of great learninge: so that it is manifest, that this which he writeth was the receiued opinion of learned men in his daies.

Gardener to the 198. obiection.

Or els vndoubtedly in suche a matter his sayinge shoulde haue bin impugned of some that wrote in his time or nére vnto the same. Nay (saith an other) if this solucion will not serue: we maye saye ỹ Chrisostome did not speak of the vessels of the Lordes cup, or suche as were then vsed at the

the Lords table, but of the vessells vsed in the temple in the olde lawe.

This answer will serue no more then the other. For heare Chrisostom speaketh of such vessells, wherin was that whiche was called the body of Christe, although it was not ỳ true body (saith he) of christe, but the misterye of Christes bodye. Now of the vessels of the olde lawe the writers do vse no such maner of phrase: for their sacrifices were not called Christes bodye. For then Christ was not but in shadows and figures, and not by the Sacrament of his body reuealed. Erasmus which was a man that coulde vnderstande the wordes and sence of the writers, although hee would not be seene to speake against this errour of Transubstantiatione, because hee durste not: yet in this time declareth plainly that this saynge of the writer is none otherwise to be vnderstanded.

Gardener in the same place.

Yet can I (saithe the third papist) finde out a fine and subtil solucion for this place and graunt all that yet is saide, bothe allowinge heare the writer, and also that he ment of the vessels of the Lordes Table. For (saith he) the body of Christe is not conteined in them, at the Lordes Table, as in a place, but as in a misterye. Is not

this

this a prytty shifte, and a mistticall solution: But by the same solution the Christes bodye is not in the Lordes Table, nor in the Prestes handes, nor in the pixe, and so is hee here no where. For they will not saye, that he is either here or there, as in a place.

This answere pleaseth so well the maker, that he him self (after he had plaid with it a little while and shewed the fineneſſe of his wit and eloquence therein) is content to giue it ouer and saye: but it is not to be thought that Chrisostome would speak after this fineneſſe or subtiltie: and therfore he returneth againe vnto the second answere for his shote anker, which is sufficiently confuted before. An other shorte place of Chrisostome I wil reherse, which (if any indifferency may be heard) in plaine termes setteth forth the trueth of this matter.

Before the bread (saith Chrisostome ad Cesarium monachum) be halowed, we call it bread, but the grace of God sanctifiyng it by the meanes of the preeſte it is deliuered now from the name of bread, and esteemed woorthy to be called Christs body, although the nature of bread tarry in it still.

Gardener to he 202. brection.

These be Chrisostoms wordes: wherin

I

I praye you, what can be saide or thoughte more plaine against this errour of Transubstantiation, then to declare, that the breade abideth so still: And yet to this so plaine a place, some are not ashamed thus shamefully to elude it, saying: we graunt that nature of bread remaineth still thus, for that it maye be seene, felte, and tasted, and yet the corporal substãce of the bread therfore is gone, leaste two bodies should be confused togither, and Christe shoulde be thought impanate.

What contrarietie and falsehod is in this answere, the simple man may easily perceiue. Is not this a plain contrarietye to graunt that the nature of bread remaineth so still, that it may be seene, felte, and tasted: and yet to saye, the corporall substance is gon, to auoid absurdity of christs impanation? And what manifest falshod is this, to saye or mean, that if the breade should remain still, then must followe the inconuenience of impanation?

As though the very breade coulde not be a sacrament of Christs body (as water is of baptisme) excepte Christe shoulde vnite the nature of breade to his nature in vnitie of persone, and make of the bread, God.

Now

Theodoret

Now let vs heare Theodoretus, which is the last of the three greek authors. He writeth in his dialogue Contra Eutichen, thus. He that calleth his naturall body, corn and breade: and also named himself a Vine tree: euen he the same hath honoured the Symboles (that is the sacramental signes) with the names of his body and blood, not changing indeed the nature it selfe, but adding grace vnto the nature.

Dial. 1.

What can be more plainly saide, then this, that this olde writer saieth, that although the Sacraments beare the name of the body and blood of Christe, yet is not their nature changed, but abideth still. And where is then the papists Transubstantiation?

The same writer to the second dialoge of the same worke against the aforesaide heretique Eutyches, writeth yet more plainly against this errour of Transubstantiation, if any thing can be saide to be more plaine. For hee maketh the heretike to speake thus against him that defendeth the true doctrine, whome he calleth Orthodoxus.

As the sacramentes of the bodye and blode of our Lorde are one thinge before the invocation, and after the invocation

then

they be changed, and are made an other: so likewise the Lords body (saithe the heretike) is after the assumption or assention into heauen, turned into the substance of God: the heretike meaninge thereby, that Christe after his ascention, remaineth no more a man.

To this Orthodoxus answereth thus and saith to the heretike: Thou art taken, (saith he) in thine owne snare. For those mistical Symbols or Sacraments after the sanctification do not goe out of theire owne nature, but they tarrye and abide stil in their substance, figure, and shape, yea and are sensibly seene and groped to be the same they were before, &c.

At these wordes the papistes do startle: and to saye the trueth, these wordes be so plaine, so full, and so clere, that they can not tell what to say, but yet they wil not cease to goe about to play the cuttles, and to caste their colours ouer them, that the trueth which is so plainly told, should not haue place.

This Author wrote (say they) before the determination of the Churche. As who would say, whatsoeuer that wicked man Innocentius the Pope of Rome determined in his congregationes with his

monks

monkes & friers, that must be (for so Duns saith) holden for an article, and of the substance of our faithe. Some do charge this author that he was suspected to be a Nestorian, which thing in Calcedon counsaile was tryed and proued to be false. But the foulest shift of al, and yet the best that they can finde in this matter, when none other will serue: is to say, that Theodoret vnderstandeth by the word (substance) accidents, and not substance indeed.

D. Moreman in the conuocation house

This glose is like a glose of a lawyer, vpon a decree, the text whereof beginneth thus: Statuimus, that is We decree. The glose of the Lawyer there (after many other prytty shifts there set forth) which he thinketh will not well serue to his purpose, and therfore at the laste to clere the matter, he saithe thus: after the minde of one Lawyer. Vel dic (saith he) Statuimus id est, abbrogamus, that is: or expound we doo decree, that is, we abragate or disanul. Is not this a godlye, and worthye glose: who will not saye, but he is worthye in the lawe, to be reteined of counsaile, that can glose so well, and finde in a matter of difficultie, such fine shifts? And yet this is the lawe, or at leaste the glose of the lawe. And therfore who can tell, what perill a

Distinc. Ca. 4 Statuimus.

man

man may incurre to speak against it, except he were a lawyer indeed, whiche can kepe him self out of the briers what winde soeuer blowe.

Hetherto ye haue heard three writers of the Greeke Church, not all what they do saye: for that were a labour to greate for to gather, and to tedious for the reader: But one or two places of euery one, the which how plain, how ful, and how cleere they be against the errour of transubstantiatio, I refer it to the iudgement of the indifferent reader.

And now I will likewise rehearse the sayings of other three old ancient writers of the latin church, and so make an end.

And first I will begin with Tertullian, whom Ciprian the holy martyr so highly esteemed, that whensoeuer he would haue his book, he was wonte to saye: Giue vs now the Maister. Tertullian

This olde writer in his fourthe booke against Martian the heretike, saith thus: Iesus made the bread, which he tooke, and distributed to his disciples, his body, saying: This is my body. That is to saye (saith Tertullian) a figure of my body.

In this place it is plaine, that after

Tertullians exposition, Christe mente not by callinge the breade his bodye, and the wine his blod, that either the breade was the naturall bodye, or the wine his natural blod, but he called them his body and blod, because he would institute them to be vnto vs Sacramentes: that is holye tokens and signes of his bodye and of his blod: that by them remembring and firmly beleeuing the benefites procured to vs by his body, which was torne and crucified for vs, and of his blod, which was shed for vs vpon the crosse: and so with thanks receiuing these holy Sacramentes, according to Christes institution, might by the same be spirituallye nourished and fed to the increase of all godlines in vs heere in our pilgrimage and iourney wherin we walke vnto euerlasting life.

This was vndoubtedlye Christe our Sauiours minde, and this is Tertullians exposition.

ardener to
e 16. Ob-
ction.

The wrangling that the Papistes do make to elude this sayinge of Tertullian, is so far out of frame, that it euen wereth me to think on it.

Tertullian writeth heere (say they) as none hath don hitherto before him.

This

This saying is too, too manifeste false: for Origene, Hilarye, Ambrose, Basill, Grigorie, Nazianzene, Saint Augustine, and other old authors, likewise do call the sacrament, a figure of Christes bodye. And where they say, that Tertullian wrot this, when he was in a heate of disputations with an heretike, coueting by all meanes to ouerthrowe his aduersarye. As who saye, he would not take heed, what he did say, and specially what he would write in so high a matter so that he might haue the better hand of his aduersarye.

Is this credible to be true in any godly wise man? How muche lesse then is it worthye to be thoughte or credited in a man of so great a wit, learning, and excellency as Tertullian is worthily esteemed euer to haue been?

Likewise this author in his first booke against the same heretike Martion, writeth thus: God did not reiect bread, which is his creature: for by it he hath made a representation of his body.

Now I praye you, what is this to say that Christe hath made a representation (by bread) of his body, but that Christ had instituted and ordeined bread to be a Sa-

crament, for to represent vnto vs his body: Now whether the representatione of one thing by an other, requireth the corporall presence of the thinge which is so represented or no: euerye man that hath vnderstanding, is able in this poynte (the matter is so clære of it selfe) to be a sufficient iudge.

augustine. The second doctour and writer of the Latin Churche, whose sayinges I promised to set forth, is S. Augustine: of whose learning and estimation, I nede not to speake. For all the Church of christe both hath and euer hath had him for a man of moste singuler learning, witte, and dilligence, both in setting forth the true doctrine of Christes religion, and also in the defence of the same againste heretikes.

This author as he hath written moste plenteously in other matters of our faith: so likewise in this argumente he hath written at large in many of his workes, so plainly against this errour of transubstantiation, that the papistes loue leaste to heare of him of all other writers partely for his authoritie, and partely because he openeth the matter more fully, then any other doth.

Therfore

Wherfore I will rehearse moe places of him then hertofore I haue don of the other. And first, what can be more plaine then that which he writeth vpon the 89. Psalme, speaking of the sacrament of the Lords body and blod: and rehearsinge (as it were) Christes wordes to his Disciples after this maner.

It is not this bodye, whiche ye dow see, that ye shall eate, nother shall ye drinke this blod, which the Souldiers that crucifie me, shall spill or shed.

I dow commend vnto you a misterye or a sacrament, which spiritually vnderstanded, shall giue you life.

Now if Christe had no moe naturall and corporall bodies, but that one which they then presently both heard and sawe, nor other naturall blod, but that which was in the same body, and the whiche the souldiers did afterward cruelly shed vpon the crosse: and nother this bodye nor this blode was (by this declaration of S. Augustine) either to be eaten or dronken, but the misterie thereof spiritually to be vnderstanded: then I conclude (if this saying and exposition of S. Augustine be true, that the mistery which ỹ disciples should

eate, was not the naturall body of Christ but a misterye of the same spiritually to be vnderstanded.

For as S. Augustine saithe in his 20. book Contra Faustum. Ca. 21. Christes flesh and blod was in the olde testament promised by similitudes and signes of their sacrifices, and was exhibited indeed and in trueth vpon the crosse, but the same is celebrated by a sacrament of remembrance vpon the aulter.

And in his book. De fide ad Petrum. Ca. 19. he saithe, that in these sacrifices, meaning of the olde law, it is figuratiuely signified, what was then to be giuen: but in this sacrifice it is euidently signified what is already giuen (vnderstanding in the sacrifice vpon the aulter) the remembrance and thankes giuing for the flesh, which he offred for vs and for the blode, which he shed for vs vpon the crosse: as in the same place and euidētly there it may appeare.

An other euident and cléer place, wher in it appeareth, that by the Sacramental bread, which Christ called his bodye, he ment a figure of his body. As vpon the 3. Psalme. where S. Augustine speaketh this

this in plain termes.

Christe did admit Iudas vnto the feaste, in the which he commended vnto his disciples the figure of his body.

This was Christes laste Supper before his passion, wherin he did ordeine the sacrament of his body, as all learned men do agree.

S. Augustine also in his, 23. Epistle to Bonifacius teacheth, how Sacraments do beare the names of the thinges whereof they be sacraments, bothe in Baptisme, and in the Lords table, euen as we call euery good friday, the day of Christes passion: and euerye Easter daye, the daye of Christes resurrection: when in very deede there was but one day wherin he suffred, and but one day wherin he rose. And why do we then call them so, which are not so indeede, but because they are in like time and course of the yeere, as those dayes were, wherin those thinges were done?

Was Christe saithe sainte Augustine, offered any more but once? And he offered him selfe. And yet in a Sacramente or representation not onelye euerye solempne feaste of Easter, but also euery daye to the people he is offered: so that he doth not lye

that saieth: he is euery day offered.

For if sacraments had not some similitude or likenes of those thinges, wherof they be Sacramentes, they coulde in no wise be sacraments: and for their similitudes or likenes: commonly they haue the names of the thinges, wherof they be Sacraments. Therefore as after a certaine manner of speech, the sacrament of christs body is Christes body, the sacramente of Christes blood, is Christes blode, so likewise the Sacrament of faith is faith.

After this maner of speach, as S. Augustine teacheth in his questiones Super Leuiticum and Contra Adimantum, it is said in scripture, that vij. eares of corne be vij. yeeres, seuen Kine be seauen yeeres, and the rock was Christe: and blood is the soule the which last saying (saith Saint Augustine in his booke Contra Adimantum is vnderstanded to bee spoken by a signe or figure.

uestion. 7.

p. 13.

utra xiimi- m. Li. 22.

For the Lord himselfe did not sticke to saye. This is my body, when hee gaue the signe of his body. For we must not consider in sacramentes saithe S. Augustine, in an other place, what they be: but what they do signifie, or they be signs of things being

beinge one thinge in themselues, and yet signifying an other thing.

For the heauenly bread (saith he) speakinge of the sacramentall breade by some maner of speach is called Christes body, when in very deed it is the sacramente of his body &c.

What can be more plaine, or more clerly spoken, then are these places of S. Augustine before rehearsed, if men were not obstinately bent to maintaine an vntrueth, & to receiue nothinge whatsoeuer doth let it forthe. Yet one place more of S. Augustine wil I alleage, which is very cleare to this purpose, that Christes naturall body is in heauen, and not heer corporally in the Sacrament, and so let him departe.

In his 50. treatice, whiche he writeth vpon Iohn, he teacheth plainly and clerly how Christe being both God and man, is both heer after a certaine maner, and yet in heauen, & not heere in his naturall body and substance, which he took of ỹ blessed virgin Mary: speaking thus of Christe and sayinge: By his deuine Maiestie, by his prouidence and by his vnspeakeable & inuincible grace that is fulfilled which

he

hee spake: Beholde, I am with you vnto the ende of the worlde. But as concerning his flesh which hee tok in his incarnatione, as touchinge that whiche was borne of the Virgine as concerninge that whiche was apprehended by the Iewes crucified vpon a tree, and take down from the crosse, lapped in linnen clothes, and buried, and rose againe, and appeared after his resurrection, as concerninge the flesh, he said: ye shall not euer haue me with you. Why so? For as concerning his flesh, he was conuersant with his Disciples xl. daies, and they accompanying, seeing and not following him, he went vp into heauen, and is not here. By the presence of his deuine maiestie he did not departe: as concerninge the presence of his deuine maiestie, we haue Christe euer with vs: but as concerning the presence of his flesh, he said truely to his disciples: ye shall not euer haue me with you. For as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had him but a few daies: nowe it holdeth him by faith, though it se him not.

Thus much S. Augustine speaketh repeating one thing so often: and all to declare and teach, how we should vnderstād

the

the maner of Christes beinge here with vs: whiche is by his grace, by his prouidence, and by his deuine nature, and how he is absent by his naturall bodye whiche was born of the virgin Mary, died, & rose for vs, and is ascended into heauen, and there sitteth, as in the articles of our faith on the right hand of God, and thence (and from none other place saith S. Augustine) he shall come on the latter daye, to iudge the quick and the dead. At the which daye the righteous shall thē lift vp their heads and the light of Gods trueth shal so shine: that falshod and errours shall be put into perpetuall confusion: righteousnes shall haue the vpper hand and trueth that daye shall beare awaye the victorye, all th'enemies therof quite ouerthrowen, to be troden vnder fot for euermore.

O Lord, Lord, I beseech thee hallē this day, then shalt thou be glorified with the glory due vnto thy holy name, and vnto thy deuine maiesty: and we shal sing vnto thee, in all ioy, and felicitie, laude & praise for euer more. Amen.

Here now would I make an end. For me thinks, S. Augustine is in this matter so full and plaine, and of that authoritye, that

that it ſhould not nede after this his declaration, being ſo firmelye grounded vpon Gods woꝛde, and ſo well agreeinge with the other ancient authoꝛs, to bꝛing in foꝛ the confirmation of this matter any moꝛe: and yet I ſaide, I would alleage thꝛee of the latin church, to teſtifie the truethe in this cauſe. Nowe therefoꝛe the laſte of all thalbe Gelaſius, whiche was a Biſhop of Rome, but one that was biſhop of that ſea beforꝛe the wicked vſurpation and tiranny therof ſpꝛed and burſt out abꝛoade into al the woꝛld. Foꝛ this man was beforꝛe Bonifacius, yea & Grigorye the firſte: in whoſe daies bothe coꝛruption of doctrine and tirannicall vſurpation did chæfiye growe, and had the vpper hand.

Gelaſius.

Gelaſius in an Epiſtle of the two natures of Chꝛiſte, Contra Eutichen, wꝛiteth thus: The ſacraments of the body and blood of Chriſte, which we receiue, are godly things whereby and by the ſame wee are made partakers of the deuine nature, & yet neuertheleſſe the ſubſtance or nature of the bread and wine dooth not departe nor goe away.

Note theſe woꝛds I beſeeche you, and conſider, whether any thing can be moꝛe

plainly

plainely ſpoken, then theſe wordes be againſt the errour of tranſubſtantiatione, which is the ground and bitter rot, wherupon ſpringe all the horrible errours before rehearſed.

Wherfore ſeing that the falſhod doth appeare ſo manifeſtlye, and by ſo many waies ſo plainly, ſo clærly and ſo fullye, that no man nædeth to be deceiued, but he that will not ſæ, or wil not vnderſtande: let vs al that dw loue the trueth, embrace it, and forſake the falſhod. For he that loueth the trueth, is of God: and the lack of the loue therof is the cauſe why God ſuffereth men to fall into errours, and to perish therin: yea and as S. Paule ſaith, why he ſendeth vnto them illuſions, that they beleue lyes, vnto their own condemnation: becauſe (ſaithe he:) they loued not the trueth. This trueth no doubte is Gods word. For Chriſte him ſelf ſaith vnto his father: Thy woord is trueth. The loue and light wherof almighty God our heauenly father giue vs, and lighten it in our harts by his holy ſpirit through Ieſus Chriſte our Lorde, Amen. Io. 17.

(✶✶)

Vincit Veritas.